



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Moravian minister, and for fourteen years has been principal of the Salem Female Academy, an influential boarding-school which has grown up under the nursing hands of his church. He has taken a pride in his work and seems to have explored the valuable church records which have been preserved in Salem with commendable care. His treatment is not that of a trained historian. It is lacking in discussions of social development. It is a publication of annals with emphasis upon the more striking incidents. The Indian war, the coming of the Regulators, the visits of Tryon and Washington, and the establishing of various villages, fill in between the ordinary details of church and town life. The failure of the community of housekeeping is dismissed with four and a half lines, and it is not considered important enough to be mentioned in the index. The allusions to the general history of the state show that the author is not well-informed in that field. He accepts the views of Caruthers on the Regulators, fails to understand Tryon, and has no question in regard to the authenticity of the Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence. The most valuable part of the book is the mass of facts taken from the manuscript records which have been preserved by the church. They represent only a small part of the large accumulation which is preserved by the Wachovia Historical Society in Salem. These facts, which are frequently given in quotation, have not been published hitherto. They are valuable for the future historian of social conditions in North Carolina. The pains with which they have been sought is exceedingly commendable. The story is also well calculated to hearten Moravians everywhere, especially in North Carolina. It reveals a life-fortitude and virtue, the goodness of which can never fail to make men desire to lead better lives and be more faithful to their ideals.

JOHN SPENCER BASSETT.

A Monograph on the Evolution of the Boundaries of the Province of New Brunswick. By WILLIAM F. GANONG, M.A., Ph.D.
[Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada. Second Series. 1901-1902. Vol. VII., Section II. Pp. 139-449.]

THE author of this monograph is a native of New Brunswick. The personal equation in boundary studies he clearly recognizes. "Unreasonable partisanship," he says, "is the natural condition of the human mind." An impartial discussion of controverted questions, however, he believes is possible; and his work gives abundant evidence that he has attempted to treat such questions connected with the northeastern boundary controversy with entire fairness and impartiality.

The purpose of the monograph is to explain the precise factors which have determined for each New Brunswick boundary line its genesis, its persistence, its position, its direction, and its length. After considering some general matters pertaining to boundaries and boundary disputes, Professor Ganong commences his discussion with a brief reference to the boundaries in the Indian period. He then calls attention to the boun-

daries in the period of discovery and exploration down to 1606. This is followed by an examination of the boundaries in the Acadian period, that is, from the Virginia Patent, 1606, to the Treaty of Paris in 1763, when Canada came into the possession of Great Britain. An examination of the boundaries in the English period, 1763-1783, follows, with especial attention to the efforts which were made to locate the river St. Croix; and the monograph closes with a consideration of boundary questions in the Loyalist and later periods. The discussion throughout is characterized by clearness and a strong intellectual grasp of the facts under review. Indeed it affords an admirable illustration of the scientific method which is now demanded in any historical inquiry.

The rightfulness of the legal claim advanced by the state of Maine in the northeastern boundary controversy Professor Ganong fully concedes. The original charters, documents, maps, etc., he says, point irresistibly to the conclusion that Maine was right in her contention. All the principal men in New Brunswick, moreover, whose duty required them to examine minutely into the documents of the case, admitted the full American claim. In 1814 the New Brunswick legislature admitted this claim, and so at least in part did the British government the same year in asking for a cession of territory to preserve the communication from Quebec to New Brunswick. Furthermore, the British claim to the Mars Hill highlands as a boundary did not make its appearance until after 1814. It was tentatively advanced in 1815, had not been elaborated in 1817, and made its first formal appearance in the controversy in 1821, in the argument of Ward Chipman. Professor Ganong's position is indicated by this further statement: "Had Mitchell's map proven to be accurate, or had the commissioners had an accurate modern map before them so they could have made their description accurate, or had they annexed a marked copy of Mitchell's map to the treaty, the controversies over the question could not have arisen, and Maine would, I believe, include the Madawaska region and would extend to the highlands south of the St. Lawrence."

But while conceding the rightfulness of Maine's legal claim throughout the northeastern boundary controversy, Professor Ganong somewhat severely criticises her conduct as a party in the controversy. He says: "But while I think Maine's legal right to her claim is clear, I can by no means justify the conduct of Maine in endeavoring to force these extreme rights. Her right to the territory in dispute was not due to her discovery, exploration, or settlement of it; it was purely accidental. Moreover, the territory was of comparatively slight value to her; she had not a settler upon it nor a road to it for half a century after the treaty was signed. On the other hand, it was settled in good faith by British subjects, and was not simply valuable, it was invaluable to Great Britain. That under these circumstances Maine insisted upon the uttermost letter of her rights, refusing all accommodation until any other settlement was hopeless, is by no means to her credit. If Great Britain appears to disadvantage in employing diplomacy to save what she legally

had lost, in another way Maine appears to at least equal disadvantage in her Shylockian even though legal policy."

In other words, Maine, like the cold, selfish, heartless, grasping Jew of the *Merchant of Venice*, insisted upon the utmost limit of her claim. But is this a fair statement of the case? Professor Ganong minimizes Maine's interest in the disputed territory. That interest antedated the Revolution. It was the great hope of the people of Maine, as it was of all New England, that Canada would form a part of the new nation. When the war closed, leaving British possessions to the northward and eastward of the district of Maine, the boundary line was not a matter of slight importance on this side of the border, even if there was not a single Maine settler in the disputed territory. If that territory was valuable, even invaluable to Great Britain from a military point of view, so it was also to Maine and to the United States. In two wars with Great Britain our people had tested their strength with the mother country, and the possibility of another conflict could not be overlooked.

But although during the boundary controversy Maine stoutly asserted her rights in accordance with the provisions of the treaty of 1783, she did not refuse to listen to propositions having in view concessions on her part; in other words, her spirit was not "Shylockian." When in 1826, in accordance with the treaty of Ghent, an attempt was commenced to settle the boundary controversy by arbitration, Maine, though opposed to arbitration, acquiesced in the attempt. When again in 1832, in a new effort to settle the boundary controversy, the government of the United States sought to obtain from Maine a free hand, the legislature of the state acceded, and declared its willingness to consider a proposition for the relinquishment of her claim to the territory in dispute, on the ground of a suitable indemnity. The same willingness was manifested in the final negotiations between Mr. Webster and Lord Ashburton, and Maine accepted the proposed indemnification.

It is not forgotten that Professor Ganong, in saying that Maine in the northeastern boundary controversy adopted a "Shylockian" policy, admits that Maine finally assented to accommodation, but he says it was only when "any other settlement was hopeless." Yet Professor Ganong in his reference to the final decision makes this statement: "Maine was in part compensated by a large sum paid her by the United States, though it must by no means be inferred that this prompted her decision, for her stand in the matter had unquestionably been taken upon principle, and her consent was given for the good of the Union." In all probability some things were learned by Maine in the progress of the controversy, but a review of all the facts seems to justify the opinion that her stand in the matter was upon principle throughout. Neither selfishness nor avarice characterized her conduct. Her course was consistent and patriotic from the beginning of the controversy to its close, and it was because of her firm and intelligent action that the British claim, which was without legal foundation, was not pushed to a successful termination.

HENRY S. BURRAGE.